

Human Legislation void, when it conflicts with the Law of God.

---

A

9

# DISCOURSE,

DELIVERED IN THE

CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,

MADISON, O., AUGUST 31, 1856.

BY

REV. R. S. EGLESTON.

---

CLEVELAND:

HARRIS, FAIRBANKS & CO., PRINTERS, HERALD OFFICE.

1856.

11

## INTRODUCTORY.

---

THE following Sermon was not intended for the press when written. It is printed in compliance with the express desire of many who heard it.

To such as have requested its publication it should be said, that the phraseology, in a few instances, has been changed, and a few sentences have been added; but the sentiment is the same as when delivered.

## DISCOURSE.

---

ROM. 13 : 1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God : the powers that be are ordained of God.

THE text admits the doctrine that civil government is of Divine appointment, and some have inferred from it, that the subject of any government is obligated to yield perfect obedience to every law which his government may enact, however unjust, oppressive, or cruel the law may be. But the general principle which the text establishes, is not absolute, nor unlimited in its application. Although God does not favor anarchy and disorder, still no civil government can possess authority superior to *his* authority, or impose upon men the obligation to obey any enactment which conflicts with the laws that he has decreed, to control human conduct. While I adopt this sentiment, and express my belief that it accords fully with the instruction of the apostle, I am aware that much evil might result from the prevalence of the doctrine, that we, as citizens, have a right to disobey all laws, which in our private judgment are unjust and burdensome. Should this liberty be granted, "the bad, the selfish, the cruel, and the grasping, might disregard wholesome laws as easily as just men unjust laws."

Society could not long exist, were each member of it to sit in judgment upon his own case, and decide the claims of such laws to his obedience as seemed to oppose his individual interest. It is no uncommon thing for human enactments to favor some while they burden others. Such has been the tendency of every system of taxation. No State has adopted laws to regulate the assessment of taxes, which have been universally approved, or which every body has considered equitable. Such, too, has been the operation of the Free School system, in this and other States. Some regard the Free School law as unjust and bur-

densome, because they are taxed by it for the support of schools in which they have no particular interest.

Every one, it is true, ought to feel interested in the subject of popular education, whether he has children to be educated or not, for as a member of society which is made better by the general diffusion of knowledge, he is benefitted. Others derive from the law a pecuniary advantage. They are not at the whole expense of educating their children. It is evident, therefore, that individuals are liable to be influenced by selfish considerations in their decision respecting the equity of law.

The general good should be the primary object in all the enactments of government. As a moral Governor, God acts upon this principle in his dealings with his subjects. And it is doubtless a correct position, that, all things considered, individual prosperity and happiness are the most effectually secured by securing the general good. Equity, in the true sense of the word, and in its application to all, is a thing unknown—it does not exist in the administration of any human government. For men are imperfect beings, and all governments which they have organized, and many laws which they have made, partake of the imperfection and fallibility of human nature. But this fact does not justify individual resistance to any law, which is designed to promote the public welfare. As members of society, we are under obligation to yield our own preferences, and obey, even though in so doing we make an individual sacrifice. “It is the duty of every good citizen to abide his time, and seek redress from the evils of bad laws at the appropriate tribunal of his country. The wrong may be sharp, the burden heavy, but any other remedy will be sharper, and in the end ruinous to the individual sufferer by the destruction of society itself. No injuries can justify resistance to laws, except such extreme cases as in their nature preclude appeal to the proper tribunals. But if the wrong that is done us extend to liberty and life itself, and redress from law is foreclosed, then we are under no obligation to obey. The social compact is dissolved; and he who suffers the wrong is thrust back on his natural rights.” It is a declaration of this nation that “all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” These are natural rights which God has bestowed equally upon all mankind. Any law which takes

them away is tyrannical. If no provision is made for redress, it has no claim to obedience. It may compel men to obey, and oppress them so low in the scale of being, as to crush out of the soul every feeling of manly independence, and blast all hopes of successful resistance; but even here they have the same rights which neither human enactment, nor the condition in which it may place them, can annihilate. Take, for example, the slave in our own land. The rights which the Declaration of our National independence declares to the world cannot be justly alienated, or transferred to another, are the very ones which are forcibly and wrongfully taken from him. He has as strong a claim to freedom as any one of us. The fact that he has always been held in bondage by a power which he cannot resist, does not justify the wrong which has been done him. Freedom, according to its usual acceptation, is an endowment bestowed upon man by his Creator. And if it be right for any one of us to maintain his freedom at any expense, the same right belongs to the slave. If he possesses the ability, he has the right to resist the authority of the law which makes him a slave, and the power that wields it, and gain his liberty. He has been guilty of no crime which makes him an outlaw. His claims to the protection of government in the possession of those rights which elevate him above the condition of a brute, are valid, and no human power can invalidate them. The system which unmans him and hands him over to another, as a thing to be possessed and used for gain, or any other selfish gratification, originated in lust, and conflicts with the law of nature and of revelation. The relation of master and slave is not of divine origin. *Man*

“Finds his fellow guilty of a skin  
Not colored like his own, and having power  
To inflict the wrong, for such a worthy cause,  
Dooms and devotes him as his lawful prey;  
And worst than all, and most to be deplored,  
As human nature's foulest blot,  
Chains him, and tasks him, and exacts his sweat  
With stripes, that Mercy with a bleeding heart  
Weeps when she sees inflicted on a beast.”

It is a self-evident truth, that “all men are created equal.” God has written it upon the tablet of the heart of every man and confirmed it by his word. In accordance with this truth, the child of the slave mother is as free as the children of these

mothers before me ; and there is the same injustice in the enslavement of the one, as there would be in the enslavement of the others. Human enactments hold the slave mother's child in abject and life-long bondage, while your children breathe the vital air of freedom. But a *higher law* annihilates the distinction, and grants to each the same right to be free.

The enactment, therefore, which oppresses the child of the bond-woman, is without force. It has no inherent element of power to render it obligatory. It is wanting in the one essential quality which constitutes any human legislation binding—harmony with the law of God. Should the oppressed disregard it, and break loose from bondage, and raise himself to a level with his fellow men, he would do just what every free man would consider right in his own case, were his liberties thus forcibly taken from him. There is not a parent among all the slaveholders of the South, nor in any of the Free States, who would yield obedience to any State or National legislation, which demanded his children, severed the natural relation which he sustains to them, nullified the authority over them which God has given him, and placed them in the possession of the grasping and avaricious as chattels or things, that can be bought and sold, and pass among men as merchandise in human flesh. His sense of justice would arouse in him the strongest opposition to a law so exacting, unrighteous and oppressive.

Moved by instinct, he would rush to the rescue of his children, and if in his power, break the arm of the law, and remove *every* obstacle which opposed their freedom ; and no “higher law” would condemn the act. But the proposition that human law has no authority when it robs us of our natural rights, interferes with conscience, or in any way comes in conflict with the law of God, may be substantiated by reference to the standard works upon the validity of law, by the decision of reason, by the dictates of conscience, and by the instruction of the Bible.

Blackstone, who is considered good authority on all points of law, and whose works are universally used in law schools and in courts of justice, takes the ground that the binding force of all human enactments, depends entirely upon their agreement with the law of God, as revealed in nature and in the Volume of inspiration. “There is a law,” says Lord Brougham, in his speech on West India emancipation, “above all human enactments,

written by the finger of God on the heart of man." And the language of Blackstone is, that "this law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this." The divine law, which God has revealed in the Bible, harmonizes with the law of nature and enforces it. "Upon these two foundations—the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human law should be suffered to contradict these." The natural and revealed law alike condemn falsehood, and theft, and robbery and murder. Should the law of any human government demand the commission of these crimes, the reason of every man, upon whom the light of revelation has shone, would decide, that duty to himself, to his fellow men, and to God, required him to disobey.

Reason teaches that all men should obey the eternal and independent law of right, "to which the Creator himself, in all his dispensations conforms." The truth is universally acknowledged by enlightened nations, that God, who is infinite and unchangeable, cannot deviate from this rule of right in the administration of his government. The supreme authority of his word is a conceded fact. Though in our own government there is much said about the obligation to obey all laws which have been tested by the constitution without any reference to their agreement with the doctrines of the Bible. But even those who seem to place the constitution of our government higher in authority than the word of God, virtually acknowledge the supreme authority of the Bible, when they promise, upon oath, allegiance to the constitution.

If they believe the decisions of the constitution to conflict with the precepts of God's word, but still hold them to be binding, they are practical Atheists, and therefore inconsistent when they place the hand upon the Bible, and appeal to its Author for the truth of the oath to support the constitution. Why do men swear by any higher authority than the constitution, if they consider that to be supreme?

But as all men who believe in the existence of a God, acknowledge in some way his supremacy, it is evident that when direct appeal is made to reason, she never determines the authority of human law to be above the divine. And when there is a conflict

between the two, the claims of the law of God upon man's obedience will be sustained at her tribunal. It is a philosophical fact, that no stream can rise higher than its source; and to every reasonable mind the truth is evident, that as God is the ground of all existences, no created being can be elevated in power above him. But it may be said, further, that *conscience* approves what the reason determines to be right.

It is a wise arrangement of the Creator, that conscience never conflicts with reason. It always accords with the apprehension of a rule of right, approving such acts as agree with the rule, and condemning such as do not agree with it. Conscience is therefore an imperative guide to the will; for men should never violate a feeling of moral obligation. As accountable beings, we must either act in harmony with our convictions of duty, or be condemned by conscience for acting contrary to them. Now, in bringing the subject under consideration to be tested by an enlightened conscience, no one can have a reasonable doubt, that the decision would sustain the authority of the divine law, when human law conflicts with it.

Conscience would not approve of theft or murder, though these crimes were committed by the authority or under the sanction of human law; for the law which God has recorded in the Bible forbids them. And the law "written by the finger of God on the heart of man" agrees with the divine law in condemning them.

Again: Supposing that our government should no longer tolerate the religion of Christ, and should pass a law that those who love the worship of God might never again engage in it—that they should pull down their sanctuaries, burn the Bible, and renounce forever the religion of their fathers. And supposing that this law should be declared constitutional by the supreme court of the nation? Do you think that conscience would hold men to obey? It would condemn obedience and approve disobedience.

In every instance where it is seen that the law of man conflicts with the law of God, the natural feeling of obligation is to obey God rather than man. It is true that men do not always yield to the conviction of right; for the action of the will may be induced by the desires, as well as by the awakened susceptibility of conscience. And although it is the design of the Creator that conscience should regulate the desires, still men are



influenced sometimes by these alone to act, even against conscience. Such is doubtless the case with those who obey human enactments which are contrary to the spirit and doctrines of the Christian religion. They act without consciousness of moral obligation.

Let us examine, in the next place, the records of the Bible, to prove the correctness of our position. God has recorded in his word numerous examples of strict adherence to his commands, when the law of man opposed them. The King of Egypt, apprehensive that danger to his government would arise, from the increasing numbers and strength of the Israelites, commanded the Hebrew midwives to kill their male children at birth; but it is said that these women feared God, and obeyed him rather than Pharaoh. The infants were saved in accordance with the will of God. But Pharaoh failing in his first wicked project to crush the power of the Hebrews, gave orders to all his people that the male infants of the Israelites should be drowned; and he doubtless affixed a severe penalty to any violation of the decree. In the case of Moses, if in no other, the decree was disobeyed; and if all the mothers had successfully resisted the enforcement of the inhuman law, and saved their tender offsprings from its murderous intent, would any one have condemned them for doing it? Would they not have been acquitted at the tribunal of conscience and of God?

The history of Daniel furnishes a remarkable instance of obedience to God, in direct violation of human authority.

At the first deportation of the people of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, he and three other youth of rank were among the captives, and were finally placed into the service of the Babylonish court. Daniel soon acquired renown for his integrity, wisdom and piety; and after the time fixed for his education in the Chaldean language had elapsed, he was elevated to important and honorable offices in the government, which he held during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and of some of his successors. After the conquest of Babylon by the allied forces of the Medes and Persians, Daniel was continued in office, and raised in power next to the king. The officers of the court over which he was placed, provoked to envy and hatred by his preferment, sought to bring some charge against him which would result in his removal from office. "But they could find none occasion nor

fault, forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him." Having failed to find any fault in him as an officer of government, they attempted in the next place to accomplish their malicious design through his religion. And in this they were confident of success. Daniel had maintained his virtuous character amid the immoralities of a licentious court, and under all the influences of worldly prosperity.

His enemies knew how strongly he was attached to the religion of his nation, and that nothing would induce him to renounce it, or to neglect the worship of his God for a single day. They went to the king, and succeeded in obtaining from him "a royal statute, and a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of the king, should be cast into the den of lions," or, in other words, should be put to death. Did Daniel obey the law which deprived him of the privilege of prayer to God, and which made Darius for a month the sole deity and benefactor of his empire? Certainly not! His enemies knew that he would not when they influenced the king to sign it. The Bible informs us that "when Daniel knew the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime."

The royal decree did not keep him away from his frequented place of prayer. Nor under the influence of fear did he seek to perform his religious duties in a more private manner than he had been accustomed to do. The privilege of prayer had been secured to him by the Being to whom he prayed, and no power but that which bestowed it could take it away. Is there one that has ever read the history of Daniel, that believes he ought to have obeyed the royal decree, and omitted his prayers even for one month? He thought differently; and it appears that God sustained his decision. The three companions of Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego were placed in circumstances under the reign of Nebuchadnezzar where they were obliged either to become idolaters or disobey the king's command, and thereby incur the penalty of being cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. In accordance with a royal decree an image of gold was made and set up in the province of Babylon, and all were required, whenever the specified signal was given, to fall

down and worship it. The Hebrew captives refused to obey, and they were summoned to appear before the king and answer to the charge of contempt of his authority. The king, who seemed to be much enraged by their audacity, commanded them in person to yield obedience to the law, that required all to worship the image which he had set up. Notice the three pious youth, as they stand in the presence of an exasperated monarch. Hear their reply to his demand that they should either yield obedience to his will, or endure the penalty which he had affixed to disobedience. "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Such magnanimity and self-possession as these young men evinced are almost without a parallel. The sequence shows that their decision met the divine approval. It is not necessary to mention other examples in the Old Testament which sustain the superiority of the law of God over that of man. We will turn to the New Testament for instruction upon this subject. At the time of our Savior's birth, wise men from the east came to Jerusalem to make inquiry respecting him.

This seems to have been the first intimation to Herod that the promised Messiah had come. Apprehensive that his crown might be in danger from this new-born King, he laid a plan immediately, under the cloak of religion, to destroy him. He sent the wise men to Bethlehem "and said, Go, and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found him bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also." God knew the design of this wicked king, and communicated to the wise men in a dream that they should not return to him. They obeyed God rather than Herod, and returned into their own country another way.

All, who have read the New Testament, have learned the fact that the apostles were often interrupted in their labors by the civil power. They could not obey the parting injunction of Christ to them—"Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," without disobeying human law. The Savior

knew this when he gave the command. He told his disciples some time before his crucifixion, that in accomplishing the work which he was about to commit to them, they would be brought before governors and kings for his sake. But he assured them that they need not be anxious about what they should say in reply to the accusations which might be brought against them, for they would be under divine guidance. His instruction is—“Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” Here is evidently an obligation laid upon the disciples to obey God rather than man, and the history which is given of their lives shows that they always disregarded the law of man whenever it interfered with the fulfillment of their divine commission. They were scourged, imprisoned, and all, but one, put to death by human authority, simply for taking the word of God as their guide in faith and practice. At one time when arrested by the arm of the civil power and thrown into prison, God sent an angel to open the prison doors and lead them out, and said to them—“Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life.” They obeyed, and in a bold and conspicuous manner repeated the very deed for which they had previously been imprisoned, by preaching salvation from sin through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. When arrested again and arraigned before the Sanhedrim for the alleged crime of violating the laws of the nation, and the high priest asked them in an authoritative manner—“Did not we straightly command you, that ye should not teach in this name?” they justified their conduct by replying—“We ought to obey God rather than man.” This bold reply was indicative of the course which they were determined to pursue; and the Sanhedrim could not mistake its meaning. But the apostles were not satisfied to intimate simply that they designed to proceed in the work, which they had begun. They *did* proceed, and immediately preached truths to the supreme council of the nation before whose tribunal they were then standing, which “cut to the heart.” Any person of ordinary powers of discernment can see that here is an instance where human law was disregarded and the law of God obeyed.

The sacred historian has recorded another instance of the deliverance of Peter from prison by miraculous interposition,

which set aside the highest human authority and allowed the apostle to continue his labors in the cause of Christ. Herod Agrippa "killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also," with the evident design of putting him to death. Herod did not assume authority in this matter, which was not secured to him by the laws of the land. He had power over life. But the apostles did not regard his authority as being supreme. While Peter was in prison bound in chains and sleeping between two soldiers, "and the keepers before the door kept the prison," an angel visited him, "and he smote Peter on the side and raised him up, saying, Arise up quickly. And his chains fell off from his hands. And the angel said unto him, Gird thyself, and bind on thy sandals; and so he did. And he saith unto him, Cast thy garments about thee and follow me. And he went, and followed him; and wist not that it was true which was done by the angel; but thought he saw a vision." "When Peter was come to himself he said, Now I know of a surety that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me out of the hand of Herod." Now if the law by which Peter was arrested, and which was about to take his life, was binding, he ought to have returned to the prison, when he found himself free, and yielded to its penalty. He had no right, though delivered by an angel from heaven, to escape and go on directly in his course, which seemed to defy the power of the law.

But it is evident that the apostles were "higher law" men. They never considered it right to hearken unto man more than unto God. It is not necessary to adduce further proof of the truth of the proposition to which your attention has been called. We find that the "higher law" doctrine is as old as the Bible. In its application to politics, it was first proclaimed in the legislative hall of our nation by one of her noble Senators some more than six years ago. Since that time it has been echoed from nearly all the Free States, and ought to have been from every pulpit in the land. The permanency and prosperity of this Republic are depending upon its recognition in the policy of the government. It is neither safe nor expedient for any nation to forget its responsibility to God, and disregard his laws in its enactments. God says—"Them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." The prin-

ciple here revealed, is one by which God is actuated in his dealings with nations as well as with individuals.

We are led by our subject to the conclusion that some of the laws of this government, and also some which it is trying to enforce in one of its Territories, are invalid. The conflict between them and the law of nature and revelation is so apparent that every one, who is guided by reason and conscience and the word of God, must feel obligated to disobey. I allude particularly to the Fugitive Slave bill, and the code of Missouri laws, with which the present Administration of the Federal government is seeking to crush out liberty and establish oppression in Kansas. The bill of 1850 was considered by its friends at the North to be a final quietus of the ever agitated subject of Slavery. But the sequel has shown the futility of the argument.

With equal consistency one might talk of putting out the fires of the volcano by outward appliances as to attempt to stop all agitation upon slavery by such legislation. The passage of the bill by Congress was *one* over-reaching effort of the Slave power to crush the liberties of freemen, and to extend itself by the aid of the General government over the whole nation. The agitation will never be quieted by such appliances. So long as the cause exists, the effect will be visible.

The objections to the bill do not arise so much from what it has done, as from what in the hand of the government, it has the power to do. Under its practical operations very few fugitives from slavery have been returned to their former, wretched condition. But it has driven many from their homes in the Free States to seek protection in the enjoyment of their rights under the British flag. It strikes a death blow at the vital principles of a Free government. Personal liberty falls before it, and is sacrificed to the interests of the Slave power. It grasps the sympathies of the human heart, and forbids the deeds of humanity, which naturally spring from them. It demands that you shall turn away the trembling fugitive, in his perishing condition, without assistance, or protection, who stands at your door asking for bread, or raiment, or shelter from the storm. It demands your help in returning him to his oppressor, from whom, under the promptings of his own nature to be free, he has manfully escaped. What a conflict between this law and the impulses of humanity!

What a conflict between it and the injunction of Christ, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them!" Who, that fears God, or regards man, feels obligated to obey it, though declared constitutional at the time of its enactment, by a pro-slavery Attorney General, and since then his decision endorsed by the supreme court of the nation? But this law, so revolting, was approved, or accepted by many, who professed to be opposed to the institution of slavery, as a compromise with the South, calculated to prevent all further excitement upon the question.

Strictly speaking, it is never right to enter into league with Satan, or to make compromises with sin. But, admitting that this bill was, when passed, a valid compact, it ceased to be such from the time of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Many of the most conservative of the North admit this. If different compromises be formed at different times, having the same end in view, and any part of one of them be broken, the treacherous party relieves the other from further obligation to any of them. Now, it is conceded by all that a compact, which at the time of its acceptance by the North was considered perpetual, was abandoned by the passage of what is termed the Nebraska bill. "A territory comprising an area of 480,000 square miles, or more than twelve times the extent of Ohio and fifty times the size of Massachusetts," was closed to the institution of slavery by the Compromise of 1820. But the bill which was passed by Congress two years ago last May, abrogated only so much of this Compromise as secured Nebraska from the curse of slavery. Missouri and Arkansas are still held by the Slave power; and no attempt has been made by the General government to release them, or to remove from them the favorite institution of the South, which gained admittance there through this noted Compromise. But can one part of the act of 1820 be repealed and the other continue in force? Not without violating every principle of honor and justice. Still, through political intrigue it has been effected. The South has realized all that was anticipated by the Missouri Compromise. The territory which she claimed by virtue of it, has all been consecrated to slavery, while the North, through the treachery of her own representatives, has been compelled, if not to fall down and worship the hideous image, which has been set up in our land of boasted

freedom, to sacrifice upon its altar, stained with human blood, a large territory, which, it was supposed, had been reserved, in safe keeping for the home of freemen. No more compromises can be made with the Slave power. It violates all agreements whenever it can, and thereby gain any advantage to itself.

Every compact is broken. Slavery and freedom are now grappling in close contest for the ascendancy in this nation. The struggle has already aroused the spirit of '76, and a voice from the graves of the fathers of the Republic is calling upon us to maintain the liberties, which they secured to themselves, and transmitted to us, and which, unimpaired, it is our duty to transmit to our children. Events which are transpiring in the nation warn us of danger. The avowed purpose of slavery is to extend itself, under the protection of the General government, into all the States and Territories of the Confederacy.

In accomplishing this object, it hesitates at nothing. There is no crime too great, no act of barbarity too inhuman for it to commit.

It assaults the friends of freedom in the streets of the Capitol of the nation. It enters stealthily the Senate Chamber, with murderous intent, and strikes down a worthy Senator in his seat, for exercising his right of freedom of speech. Supported by our government, "it now stands erect, clanking its chains on the Territory of Kansas, surrounded by a code of death, and trampling upon all cherished liberties, whether of speech, the press, the bar, the trial by jury, or the electoral franchise." The series of crimes which have been committed against the Free State men in that Territory is without a parallel in the history of any government ever known to have existed even in a state of half civilization. They are imprisoned for loving liberty and hating oppression. Theft, robbery, arson and murder are frequent; and we have yet to learn that any effort has been made by the proper authorities to bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. If the officers, who have been placed there by the supreme power of the government to administer justice, do not commit these crimes themselves, they wink at them when committed by others, or shout in approbation of them as pleasing to their idol slavery. The voice of the blood of our brethren crieth to us from the plains of Kansas. The lamentation of widows and fatherless children is wafted to our ears on almost every western



breeze. We apply to the Chief Executive of the Union for redress, and are coldly referred back to the very ones against whom lieth the charge of robbery and murder.

Men of the North who hate slavery will not suffer such insult to freedom to pass unrebuked ; nor will they leave their brethren in Kansas, without aid, to be oppressed by laws which have been made for them by citizens of a neighboring State, and which repudiate the constitutional liberties of a free people. There is a source through which these grievances can be reached, and effectually removed. It is through the ballot box. To this source men of all former political parties, who are in favor of freedom in Kansas, and opposed to all further encroachments of the slave power, are now hopefully looking. The feeling is prevalent at the North, that there has been already too much yielding to the demands of the South. "The non-slaveholding population constitutes nearly seven-eighths of the whole voting population in the nation." And yet we have never had a Chief Magistrate who has openly avowed himself as being opposed to the further extension of slavery, or who on such an issue has been elevated to that office. The united terms of office of the slave-holding Presidents amounts to fifty-two years. These facts show that in all our Presidential elections slavery has demanded a hearing. Its interests have so long been consulted, that now it takes hold of the arm of the government to crush all opposition to its encroachments upon the rights of the Free States. But slavery through the government cannot arrest the movement of the people in favor of freedom. They are sundering party ties, abandoning party preferences, and uniting in one mighty effort to protect the tree of liberty from the deadly blows which have been aimed at it from the National Capitol, and to shield it from those withering blasts which are beating upon it from the South. They will not worship at the shrine of slavery ; but will resist the power which is trampling upon their constitutional rights, and laying waste by fire and sword the homes of the friends of freedom. They will not yield the essential principle in our government, that the government belongs to the people, and is not above them, or a thing distinct from them. They will not receive the doctrine which has been proclaimed in the Senate Chamber of the nation, that men are sent to Congress to govern the people, and not to administer the government for them. Some o

the representatives from the North have heretofore betrayed the trust committed to them. But now we have men in Congress who represent their constituents, with honor to themselves and to the cause of freedom. They have been weighed in the balance and *not* found wanting. They are the men for the times. They fear God. They love liberty. They say to slavery, "thus far mayest thou come, but no further." Threats of assassination with the bowie-knife, the pistol, or the bludgeon, do not move them from their position. We need more such men in our halls of legislation. We need them in the judicial and executive departments of the government, where they will administer the government for us and not over us. They can be found among the friends of liberty.

Let us use the means which we possess through the electoral franchise, to elevate them to these responsible offices, praying God, who holds in his hand the destiny of the nation, to speed the right.